



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a fact that has been too little appreciated in all discussion of such matters—that no expense of time or money is spared, or scientific principle neglected, in order to produce something that shall pass for marvelous.

A bibliography of 160 authors will be appreciated by psychologists and all others who may wish to investigate the subject. G.

(70) *Les éléments du caractère et leurs lois de combinaison.* By PAULIN MALAPERT. Alcan, Paris, 1897, pp. 302.

Every one interested in the subject of Mr. Malapert will find this book very profitable reading. The author is not very original, a fact which he himself acknowledges again and again; and he does not claim that he proposes a classification which is worthy of being called new. But he offers a very conscientious study; he knows his subject thoroughly, and, it seems to me, that he is especially successful in his mild criticism of authors who have dealt with this subject before.

First of all Mr. Malapert denies the necessity of considering the physiological aspect of the question as the basis of the whole problem. He proves clearly that even the authors who advanced physiological causes were finally forced to admit that they, after all, really used psychical arguments in their studies and especially in the classification of characters. Pages 7-9, he gives a very good criticism of Mr. Fouillée's theory of temperament, founded on biological causes. Pages 14-15, he gives his own point of view.

Where have we to study character? Mr. Malapert admits that the nucleus of character is individual, and is innate with us. The external conditions, milieu, climate, etc., may only modify, but do not create this primitive nucleus. (He tries to show here that H. Taine, who has often used a very sharp language indeed, has been generally misunderstood.) It would seem, then, that the place where the very essence of the character is to be studied is with the child. But, says Mr. Malapert, there character has not yet had occasion to manifest itself. On the contrary, only with the adult we may study character in its whole development: at the age of twenty or twenty-five, but not earlier, man has had occasion to show all the different aspects of his character.

First Part. In order to avoid the one-sided theories on character found with his predecessors, Mr. Malapert, before offering a classification of character as a whole, proposes four classifications, one for each element constituting the character as a whole. Classification according to sensitiveness, to intelligence, to automatic will, and to voluntary (that is, conscious) will. All of these classifications rest on a single principle, that of *more and less*. I can not enter into any details here; there are a great many sub-divisions for each of these large classes.

Second Part. This part gives us the laws of the combination of the elements of the character, the different degrees of sensitiveness of intelligence, and so on. Like the rest of the book this part also is worked out very carefully. But there is no strict order in the arrangement of the matter. This is not meant as a reproach, for, if such order existed, it would presuppose a single principle to direct us. But as Mr. Malapert himself recognizes, we have not yet advanced so far in the study of character as to arrive at unity. The fourth chapter shows this very clearly. After a short exposition of the most valuable classifications of character made within the last few years, and an excellent criticism of the most important failures in each, the author offers, as being the best within the present reach, a combination of the theories of MM. Fouillée and

Ribot. (*Apathiques—Affectifs—Intellectuels—Actifs—Tempérés—Volontaires.*) As will be readily seen, the author does not assume the responsibility of giving the preference in classification either to sensitiveness, or to intelligence, or to will. Consequently he presents a mixture void of all unity. Perhaps, when we shall have arrived at a better and more thorough knowledge of the essence of these three faculties, we shall be able to decide. As far as one can judge now, it seems to me that intelligence should be considered the leading faculty. The fact alone, that, except when one has phenomena entirely automatic to deal with, the intellectual element is never wanting, while the elements of sensitiveness and of will are very often completely absent, would constitute a strong argument in favor of intelligence.

Third Part. In the fifty last pages of the book, we have the theories of formation and development of character which we have just studied in its broadest and most many-sided manifestations. I only mention the fact that in the problem of the influence of will, Mr. Malapert finally takes his place among the Neo-Criticists, and especially he shares the view of Mr. Renouvier. This does not seem to me to be a very valuable feature of the book. The "formula" the author arrives at in his conclusion: "It is the duty of every one to have a character" (*Le devoir pour chacun, c'est d'avoir du caractère*), is in fact nothing but words. However, the book loses none of its value on account of this; it is the best means of becoming acquainted with the present state of researches in this very important chapter of psychology.

A. SCHINZ, PH. D.

(71) *Essai sur l'obligation morale.* By GEORGE FULLIQUET. Alcan, Paris, 1898, pp. 450.

Mr. Fulliquet is an author who became celebrated some years ago by his book, "La pensée religieuse dans le Nouveau Testament." I can but regret that he has abandoned the field of theological studies as well as the field of historical researches, for in both kinds of work he is a man who can do much towards the advancement of science. His "Essai sur l'obligation morale" is a new assertion (exactly as the book of the Abbé Piat, which will also be reviewed in this number of the JOURNAL) of ancient philosophy in opposition to recent theories to-day prevalent in Ethics. Mr. Fulliquet has many qualities in common with old philosophers; among others prolixity (his essay consists of no less than 450 large sized pages) and a great talent for repeating well-known ideas, and even ideas he himself has already developed in other parts of his book. I admit that the author has a great talent of exposition and a very good style. I admit, also, that his way of argumentation is in general on a higher level than that of the Catholic author I spoke of. I admit especially that his intentions are excellent; but I do not admit that such philosophical publications are of any value. It is beautiful; it is elegant; it is sincere; it is generous—in a word it shows the spirit of the metaphysical publications in France, but it is not scientific. Besides, in spite of all his efforts, the author does not do justice to the philosophy of to-day. If he himself recognizes that the theory of "Libertas Indifferentiae," with the so-called Ass of Buridan, was proposed before Aristoteles, and if, on the other hand, the scientists are not willing to accept it, there must certainly be some very good reason for it. And if even they should decidedly be wrong, then the partisans of liberty must have other arguments to offer than such as have been proposed over and over again, and which have proved unable to compel silence among determinists. Every one knows that the partisans of liberty affirm